

A

# CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY

• AT THE VISITATION

HELD IN

The Cathedral Church of St. Luke, at Halifax,

ON THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 1874,

BY

HIBBERT, LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

---

Published at the request of the Diocesan Synod.

---

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

PRINTED BY JAMES BOWES & SONS, BEDFORD ROW.

1874.

A  
BX5612  
• H3B5  
1874

I

7

HI

PR

*The Lord Bishop of Nova Scotia  
John W. H. H. H.  
H. H. H.*

A

## CHARGE

DELIVERED TO THE CLERGY

AT THE VISITATION

HELD IN

The Cathedral Church of St. Luke, at Halifax,

ON THE 30TH DAY OF JUNE, 1874,

BY

HIBBERT, LORD BISHOP OF NOVA SCOTIA.

---

Published at the request of the Diocesan Synod.

---

HALIFAX, N. S.

PRINTED BY JAMES BOWES & SONS, BEDFORD ROW.  
1874.

A  
BX5612  
H3B5  
1894

My

In

event

than

four

not b

of the

Rom

to all

the o

ing a

proce

our

these

The

refor

rejec

of th

posit

may

pray

wher

main

V

we c

altho

the C

than

\*B

Synod

2. As

in wo

## A CHARGE.

---

MY REVEREND BRETHREN,—

IN my last Charge I stated that, in the previous four years, more events had occurred materially affecting the interests of the Church than in any similar period within the memory of living men. The four years which have elapsed since the delivery of that Charge have not been marked by such prominent events as the disestablishment of the Church of Ireland, the Lambeth Conference, or the Council at Rome, but they have been by no means devoid of matter of interest to all Churchmen. The progress of events at Rome, the growth of the old Catholics, the German Legislation for the purpose of bringing all religious bodies under the absolute control of the State, the proceedings of the Irish Synod, and the anomalous condition of our Mother Church, afford occasion for serious thought, some of these things awakening hope, and others causing fear and anxiety. The principle avowed by the old Catholics is that on which our own reformation was, or was intended to be, conducted, the principle of rejecting Roman accretions, and maintaining the faith and practice of the early ages of the Church; and if they can maintain their position, and are not led astray by rationalists and fanatics they may occupy a glorious position in the Western Church.\* We should pray for them that they may be guided through the many dangers whereby they are beset, and become efficient witnesses for, and maintainers of, the “faith once for all delivered to the saints.”

What will be the result of the deliberations of the Irish Synod we cannot yet determine, but there has been much cause for fear, although there are now more hopeful signs, that the members of the Church of Ireland are bringing upon themselves far worse evils than those necessarily consequent upon its disestablishment. In

---

\*By the last mail, we have received very encouraging accounts of their first Synod, at which five declarations were adopted: 1. As to the principles of reform. 2. As to confession. 3. As to fasting. 4. As to the use of the national language in worship. 5. As to revision of the Liturgy.

their antagonism to Roman error, they appear to be abandoning the Catholic faith; and if the counsels of the more violent members should unhappily prevail, they may be entirely separated from communion with the Church of England, with which they were but lately so closely united. When the old paths are deserted, the probable extent of aberration from the right way can not be accurately determined.

In England, on the other hand, there is no probability of any change in the standards of doctrine, or in the authoritative teaching of the Church, but there is far too much of individual license, so that we must admit the common complaints of lawlessness to be not altogether without foundation, whether we regard those who neglect what she has enjoined, or those who practise and teach what she has discouraged or prohibited. Consequently there is a feeling among the Rulers of the Church, that something must be done to vindicate their authority, and to compel obedience to their mandates; and it is not for me to criticise their action, but I may express my fear, that, unless they are wise and prudent, there will be a lamentable disruption, resulting ultimately in the disestablishment of the National Church, and the multiplication of sects. Let us hope and pray that all may be so over-ruled by the great Head of the Church, that peace and order may be restored, and lawlessness restrained, without undue restrictions, or the loss of any earnest, devoted laborers in the Lord's vineyard, through injudicious treatment. Grievously has our Church suffered in times past, through the suicidal policy of driving out some of her most zealous and useful servants; may she be preserved from a repetition of her error.

The reference to the unsettled state of the Church in England, recalls to our minds the irreparable loss sustained by the removal of that illustrious man, late of Winchester, but better known as Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Oxford, whose wisdom in counsel, and far sightedness, would have been invaluable to his brethren in the present crisis. By common consent, the revival of the living action of the Church in her Convocations, her Synods, her Congresses, and the remarkable increase of the co-operation of influential laymen in Church work, are attributed to his influence, beyond that of any other individual; and from the primate of all England

downwards all who had been accustomed to work with him, and were most capable of judging of his merits, and of his beneficial influence, both in counsel and in action, have borne testimony to his worth, and lamented his sudden removal.

At a special united meeting of the two Houses of the Convocation of Canterbury, the Archbishop said: "When we consider how much more he did than is given to the lot of the most gifted of men, when we consider how deep was the mark he left almost everywhere, during his long episcopate; we can scarcely believe he leaves his work unfinished. Yet doubtless the loss will be felt as a calamity, and that over a wide range, such as the departure of scarcely any other man from amongst us would have reached. Doubtless not only in England, but in our colonies his loss will be deeply felt.—It was not that strange persuasiveness, it was not that wonderful power of rhetoric which gave him his great influence, it was something deeper which made him so dear to every one. It was a real, genuine, genial Christianity, which enabled him thus to reach men's hearts, and which makes every one of us feel as though we had lost an intimate friend."\*

As colonists, we may not pass over, without special notice, the death of the foremost of the Colonial Bishops, the Metropolitan of South Africa, the indefatigable and stout-hearted Bishop Gray, One who knew him well, the present Bishop of Edinburgh, said at a public meeting, that from his knowledge of Bishop Gray, he believed there had appeared no holier, more faithful, or more christian like character during the present generation. "With regard to the actual work which he accomplished, and which no one could have accomplished without a strength of will and an energy of mind almost beyond that which men possessed, no one knew how much the English Church has gained from the struggles in South

---

\*Dean Stanley, preaching on the Sunday after his funeral, said: "We have been warned in various tones, that such as he was is not likely to adorn the tale of our eventful annals. It may well be so, for such a rare, and at the same time such an intricate combination of qualities, comes once in the age of a nation and comes not again." "The office of an English Bishop grew, as it were, under his hand almost into a new institution. His example became perforce contagious. No Bishop, no clergyman, we might even say no layman, within his reach, could stand still without feeling the touch, the stimulus, the magic atmosphere of an activity, which could neither rest itself, nor, as has been well said, suffer those around him to rest."

Africa." And a resolution of the S. P. G., contained this statement, that "his single minded devotion of himself and his substance to the work of God, his eminent administrative ability, his zeal which never flagged, his considerate tenderness in dealing with others, his undaunted courage in grappling with unexpected obstacles in the defence and confirmation of the Gospel, will live in the records of the African Church as the qualities of her founder, and will secure for him a place in history as one of the most distinguished in that band of Missionary Bishops, by whose labors in this generation the borders of the Church have been so widely extended."

Having thus commemorated two of the chief Pastors, who have been taken from the Church on earth, since the last Visitation, I have now to speak of our own special loss. Our meeting together at this time is saddened by the removal of the Venerable Brother, whose kindly greetings and hearty welcome you have for many years received on coming to the city, who, occupying as Dean the foremost place, was esteemed and respected still more on account of his personal qualities than of his official dignity. The duties of his office may be efficiently performed by others, but I think you will all concur with me, that he occupied a position in relation to yourselves which cannot soon be filled; for his age and experience, combined with his well known integrity, and largeness of heart, procured for him a personal influence, such as can only be enjoyed by one advanced in years, and placed where he may have opportunities of frequent intercourse with his brethren, an influence which was constantly directed to the promotion of peace and harmony. He held firmly to his own opinions, and respected the same firmness in his brethren who differed from him; but he rightly held, that diversity of views could not justify ministers of the same Church in holding aloof one from another, or in refusing to co-operate in works designed for the glory of God. How extended was his hospitality, how genial his disposition, and how comprehensive his sympathy, you need not to be reminded. Some of you can speak, from the experience of many years of happy and profitable intercourse, but I would set him before my younger brethren as an example of persevering, earnest labor in the Lord's vineyard, as one who was ever ready to attend to every call of duty, who never regarded his



own convenience, nor pleaded weariness, when his services were required by any even the most lowly of his Parishioners, or for the interests of the Church at large. He always evinced a lively interest, and took an active part, in every Church work, and especially in the Synod and in our Diocesan Society, where his counsels were received with marked deference. It would have been a sore trial to him to live for any long period, destitute of power to work, and his Master was pleased to spare him that trial, and after a short interval of retirement, he entered into his rest, his last appearance in this Church being on the Festival of the Purification, when he assisted at the Holy Communion, and read in the Gospel the words of the aged Simeon most appropriate to himself. Although he might have spoken of himself, as 'abounding in the work of the Lord,' his feelings on his death bed were expressed in the words of the hymn, the last read to him at his own request, "Just as I am without one plea, but that thy blood was shed for me." "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord, that they may rest from their labors and their works do follow them."

While enumerating those who have been removed, I cannot forbear noticing one who, although not strictly speaking a Clergyman of this Diocese, always evinced an interest in its welfare, and in all our proceedings, which could not have been exceeded if he had been in truth merely one of ourselves, without any special duties or interests. The Rev. J. C. Edghill, to whom I refer, certainly did good service in this city, and while his attention was chiefly given to the Troops under his care, among whom he exercised a remarkable influence for good, he was eminently useful to the numerous civilians who crowded his Chapel, including many not belonging to our Communion. We may grieve, that he met with opposition from some who, seeing his work, ought to have been among the first to bid him "God speed"; but although he may at times have been somewhat discouraged, he persevered, knowing that he was sincerely striving to do the work of the Lord, and that, in the way which he had adopted, the divine blessing had been abundantly vouchsafed to him. I believe indeed that his residence among us, and the pattern which he proposed for our action, was beneficial to us all, and that some of you will cheerfully

admit that you are greatly indebted to him for suggestions, which have added much to the power of your ministrations. He was commended to me, by the Chaplain General, when he came to this garrison, as one who had been singularly successful in his labors for the conversion of sinners; and we have reason to believe that here also under his ministry many were brought to the knowledge of the truth. We may not all have his power, but we may all strive with the same earnestness, and the same love for our Lord and for the souls of men.

We are thankful that our ranks have not been thinned by many deaths, but there have been numerous removals, suggesting matter for serious reflection, for most of them are to be attributed to the insufficiency of the salaries provided for the Clergy in this Province, five of our brethren having been allured to the Diocese of Fredericton by better offers than could be obtained here. Now why is this? Cannot Nova Scotia provide for the Clergy as well as New Brunswick? I have no doubt that it *can*; and I believe the people generally would be very indignant, if we were to adopt the opposite opinion. If then they have the ability, how is it that they have not the will? Is it not possible that you may have to blame yourselves partially for this state of things? I say *partially*; because, without reference to your personal action, the people all know that it must be their bounden duty to provide for those who minister to them, and cannot plead ignorance; but still it may be, that you have not each done all that might have been expected towards enforcing this obligation. You are the duly appointed teachers of the several congregations, and it is for you to set before them their duty. I can understand the difficulty of pleading for oneself, but false delicacy should not be allowed to interfere with the performance of your duty. The Lord himself "hath ordained, that they who preach the Gospel should live of the Gospel," and he that is taught in the word should "minister unto him that teacheth in all good things." I think that, if the duty of giving were more frequently inculcated, it would not be so much neglected. It should be treated as part of our duty to God, as an act of worship well pleasing to *Him*. So long as their contributions are regarded, merely as payments for the services of a Clergyman, each will

naturally consider what his neighbor does, and what is a fair proportion for himself; and he will estimate this proportion much too favorably for himself in all probability; but if the truth be recognised, that God demands such offerings, that he requires a portion of every one's income for himself, and that what is given for the service of the sanctuary is truly offered to *Him*, then much larger amounts may reasonably be expected.

Moreover, I believe, that there is a definite rule given to us in Holy Scripture, and, that the law of tithes is still in force, that God requires from every one, *at the least*, one tenth of his yearly income, whether large or small, that this is as it were His tax, and that freewill offerings in the strict sense, only begin after payment of these dues. The payment of tithes was certainly antecedent to the giving of the law, since Abraham paid them to Melchisedec; and hence we may infer that, as the Father of the faithful paid them to the type of our High Priest, so are we bound to pay them to the High Priest himself, through those who minister in his name. If this principle were generally recognised, even supposing the tithe to include the *whole* of a man's offering, for all purposes, for the poor as well as to the Church, there would be no room for complaint of want of funds for carrying on the Lord's work. And even if the obligation to pay the *tithe* be not admitted, there can be no doubt that God claims a *portion* of what has been entrusted to each one's stewardship; and you are not faithful ministers if, through delicacy or from any other motive, you neglect to set forth the teaching of Holy Scripture concerning this matter. In any case you may avail yourself of the aid of the Rural Dean to enforce your own personal claims. If you cannot speak for yourself, he can speak for you, and in this respect the appointment of Dean may be made more particularly useful.

And if some are induced to quit this Diocese, by the insufficiency of the stipends provided for them, still more have we to deplore the effect in diminishing the number of Divinity Students at our College, and of Candidates for Holy Orders. This is an old story; and on former occasions I have spoken at length of the evil, and of the best mode in my judgment of remedying it, but the matter is of such extreme importance, that I do not hesitate to repeat my

remarks, and again to call upon you to consider, whether you are each doing your duty with respect to it. I again express my conviction that, if you *were*, the dearth of laborers would not be so serious as it is at present. I have begged you to be constantly on the watch in your Sunday Schools, and elsewhere in your Parishes, for boys who may be educated and trained for the ministry, with a reasonable hope that as they advance in years they will be inclined to devote themselves to the work. But my exhortations have thus far been in vain, and very few of you have, to my knowledge, attempted to act upon them. Parents should be pressed to devote a son to the Lord's service. There is a natural reluctance to prepare sons for an office, in which they can hardly hope to procure a reasonable maintenance, but this difficulty does not appear to affect the supply of ministers for the several denominations of Christians around us. Why should *we* then suffer so much? Are our people less liberal, less disposed to provide adequately for those who minister to them in Holy things, or is there less zeal and devotion among ourselves? Now that all have the rudiments of a good education, there ought to be found youths qualified to proceed further, with aspirations beyond the counting house, and desiring to labor rather for the good of their fellow creatures, than for their own gain. This course implies faith and foresight, for the service of the children who may be influenced by you, can only be available after a long interval, but we have to provide for the future; and it matters little whether we are permitted, in any matter, to see the fruit of our labors, so long as the Church is benefitted. If we feel the evils of the dearth of ministers now, let us be the more anxious to avert them from those who shall come after us. For students preparing for Holy Orders, our College provides very nearly free board, as well as a free education; and I am not yet without hope that we may have a great increase in the number of young men availing themselves of such a liberal provision. That we must depend chiefly upon the College, for a supply of duly trained Clergymen, is certain; and we must all admit that, as a general rule, a Minister ought to have some acquaintance with the language in which the Holy Scriptures have been given to us, and to be able at least to refer to his Greek Testament with ease.

Whether you are Once more I must say that I think more might be done by you, express my con- in the way of recommending parents to send their sons to Windsor, could not be so whether as Divinity Students or otherwise. I am aware that dis- constantly on atisfaction has been expressed, and we are sometimes told that you your Parishes, do not care to recommend our old University. But, putting aside ministry, with a vague declamations, and statements so evidently exaggerated that all be inclined they could not be of any use, we have not been favored with any ons have thus statements of actual tangible objections, nor with any practical sug- my knowledge, estions for the improvement of our system. It is not by keeping pressed to devote loof from organizations, good in themselves, that abuses can be etance to pre-emedied, or improvements effected, but by taking an active part e to procure a them, and earning an influence, through the manifestation of an appear to affect onest interest in their progress and success.

of Christians I have spoken of means to be used, for procuring a more ade- Are our people uate supply of laborers, but I do not forget the directions of our for those who treat Head. He also had to complain, "the harvest truly is and devotion lenteous, but the laborers are few;" and he hath commanded, nts of a good pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth ed to proceed laborers into his harvest." We must appeal to Him, to incline , and desiring the hearts of men to devote themselves to his service, with a single than for theirsire for his glory and the salvation of souls. The public recog- for the servicesition of this principle in the call to prayer in 1872, at the instance nly be availablef the two great Missionary Societies of our Church, was most future; and it theering, when the members of our Communion throughout the ter, to see the world united in one great act of intercession; and their voice was ed. If we feel eard, and many came forward to offer themselves for the work, e more anxious loved as we may not doubt by the Holy Spirit in answer to our

For students rayers. It would be well to have such an appointed day annually, ery nearly free r there are ever increasing needs, and the same mode of providing t without hope r them will ever be found effectual; but unhappily, owing to the of young men eakness of our nature, any such appointment, when it recurs at That we must ated times, is much less impressive than when made upon a special of duly trained ecession; the same warmth and earnestness are not excited by it, t, as a general its efficacy is proportionately diminished. An annual observ- n the language e of the day would probably become, with very many, merely a and to be able tatter of routine, but we may well be guided by the decision of the Church in England in this matter, and in any case let us not

neglect the ordinary use of the means upon which, above all others, we may expect the blessing of God. Let us urge the Lord's people, to give attention to this great want, and to remember constantly in their supplications and prayers.

And while we pray for *more* laborers, let us not neglect the order of the Church, to pray for those who are from time to time to be ordained to the Ministry. It is vain to speak to your congregations upon this subject, unless you are yourselves careful to use the prayers appointed for the Ember Days in your public services. We are constantly hearing complaints, that this or that Clergyman is deficient in power, in piety, in eloquence, in diligence, or in some other respect; may not our people be taught that *they* cannot have no right to complain, who have not habitually and earnestly prayed, that the needful gifts and graces may be bestowed, upon those who are charged with the cure of souls? In this age, qualifications are needed such as in the last generation were rarely called into requisition. Objections are to be met, and obstacles are to be overcome, such as had not then to be encountered. Moreover much more is now expected of every man, who occupies a prominent position, and claims the obedience or respect of any portion of his fellows. You must aim at much more than mere performance of routine duties. An *efficient* minister, is one who is ready to take advantage of all the opportunities afforded by varying circumstances and unexpected occurrences. For example, if there is a revival among the members of any of the neighboring congregations, or an endeavour to produce one, he will not sit still, complaining of the efforts of others, and suffering his flock to be scattered; he will meet work with counterwork of a better kind, and, if there is any real awakening, any increase of seriousness and of solicitude about spiritual things, pervading the community, he will avail himself of it to the advantage of his own people. This is a remarkable characteristic of the most earnest and successful of the Clergy in England, at the present day, who are proving that the Church is a living body, able to adapt her mode of working to the requirements of each generation. Hence among other experiments,—the missions held from time to time in large towns and cities, and more especially in London, which appear to have been

productive of much good, and of which we may hope that the effects will be lasting.

the Lord's These missions have not yet been introduced here, but there is room for them, and if rightly conducted, they may be very beneficial. To the success of such an effort in any given place, two things seem more particularly essential; 1st, an earnest loving time to time to preacher, and 2nd, fervent faithful prayer. May we not, my brethren, attribute many of our failures, and our want of success to use then our ministry, to the lack of faith? We are doubtful, wavering, even while we pray for ourselves and for our people, and we receive nothing. Is it not so that we are often so weak in faith that, while we fully recognise the efficacy of prayer in the abstract, we do not look for, or expect, the desired answer to our own special intercessions on behalf of others, any more than if we were of those who avowedly deny its power and the possibility of its effective operation. This is probably most applicable to the public prayers; and yet of these we ought to believe and to teach that they must prevail, that a special blessing is promised to united prayer. May I not remind you of the specific answer vouchsafed the united prayers of the whole Kingdom, when two years ago the Prince of Wales was raised up from the bed of sickness, and restored to health, snatched out of the very jaws of death? and who is ready to answer to the prayers on the day of Intercession to which I have already referred? Only let us not presumptuously expect an answer to prayers, while we neglect anything that we can ourselves do towards the desired object; there is no promise of blessing to complainers. We must be "up and doing," while we acknowledge that though "Paul may plant, and Apollos may water, it is God that giveth the increase," and do all with humble reliance upon Him, of the blessing to be secured by earnest believing supplication.

While speaking of public prayers, I may notice the Amended Act of Uniformity of 1872, allowing much more liberty than had been previously been enjoyed in our services. The Clergy who are content with providing for their people two services on each Sunday, are not affected by this Act; but to you my Brethren, who, other expiated by a deep sense of your responsibilities, are multiplying the towns and services, and laboring to the utmost of your ability, the provisions to have been

of this Act afford a welcome relief, enabling you to adapt your services to the exigencies of time and place, and to the circumstances of the people among whom you minister. Having already issued a synopsis of the Act for your use, I need only remind you that no special or additional form of service is lawful, unless it be "approved by the Ordinary." A list of Psalms for special occasions, prepared in accordance with the request of the Synod, is now ready and will be published.

You may perhaps expect me to speak of the all-important subject of education, causing so much perplexity to the Home Government, and to those responsible for the administration of public affairs in these Colonies; but I can add nothing to what I have said in former Charges, respecting both general education, and the teaching in our Sunday Schools. The latter more than ever demands your most serious attention, now that a merely secular system is adopted by the State schools. We probably, all of us, hold that this system is very objectionable, although we deem partial instruction better than ignorance; and if a feasible plan should be devised for granting aid to denominational schools, fairly and impartially, we ought to combine in striving for its adoption.

In my last Charge, I mentioned that an Appeal was pending before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, in the case of Mr. Purchas of Brighton, against the decision of the judge of the Archbishop's Court the Court of Arches. The appeal has since been heard, and judgment was delivered in 1871, on an *ex parte* statement, Mr. Purchas being unrepresented. The use of Vestments, and the position of the Celebrant at the Lord's Table, were the chief points to be determined, and judgment was given: "That the Cope is to be worn in ministering the Holy Communion, on high feast days in Cathedrals and Collegiate Churches, and the surplice in all other ministrations;" also that the Prayer of Consecration is to be used at the north end of the table, so that the Minister looks south. "If it had happened, as it does in one of the Chapels Royal, that the north side had been where the west side usually is, a question between the letter and the spirit of the rubrics would have arisen."

This judgment occasioned much excitement at the time of its



delivery, and was regarded as so indefensible that the then Attorney General, Sir J. Coleridge, applied for a re-hearing, in order that counsel might be heard for the defendant, and a large number of the Clergy of England signed a protest against any interference with a position which, as it now appears, had been in many places customary from the era of the Reformation.\* The judgment has been the cause of unceasing controversy, up to the present time, being regarded, even by those who are least disposed to violate the law, as not binding either in law or on the conscience. As the cause was undefended, and the question has therefore not been argued, it is held that no one, except the actual defendant, Mr. Purchas, is bound by the judgment, which moreover, according to the opinion of Sir R. Phillimore, contradicted a previous decision of the same Court, that the words of the rubric standing "before the table" apply to the whole sentence. How their Lordships reconcile these two decisions I am not able to explain. The Lord Chancellor himself lately said in the House of Lords, "every one knows how extremely hard it is for any person, for any layman, perhaps for any lawyer, to be satisfied that these two decisions are reconcilable with each other." It is probable now, that the question will be again fully argued, before the lately constituted Court of Appeal, and it is to be hoped that all parties will submit to the judgment whatever it may be. The position cannot be essential, and even they who most strenuously maintain the propriety of the one, or of the other mode, may well submit to the law when impartially expounded. But the two portions of the judgment must stand or fall together. If the Minister is always to stand at the north end of the Holy Table, the Cope must be worn in Cathedrals, the celebrant being attended by an Epistoler and Gospeller, agreeably habited, according to the requirements of the canon, and the surplice must be worn by the Clergy, in all their ministrations with that exception, so that there will no longer be any excuse, if there ever has been, for the use of the gloomy black gown, in any of our ministrations.

---

\*There are hundreds, if not thousands, of Clergymen whose habit it has been all their lives before ritualism was thought of, certainly before it was developed, to stand in the other position, *i. e.*, looking East.—*Speech of Lord Chancellor Cairns.*

How far these decisions of the Judicial Committee apply to *us*, I do not pretend to be able accurately to determine, but I presume that if we are bound by them at all, we must be bound altogether. We cannot pick and choose, according to our own tastes, if there is a legal obligation; but on the other hand if, as I believe, we in the Colonies are not legally bound to obey them, we may take them as a guide to the meaning of the rubrics and formularies of the Church, and when they are evidently the honest unbiassed interpretations of able men, they must commend themselves to us, as binding our consciences.

There has been another still more important case, which I must not pass over unnoticed, as the charge was of preaching false doctrine. I refer to the case of Mr. Bennett, who, by the use of language utterly indefensible, afforded the desired opportunity to those who wished to check the preaching of the doctrine held by him, with respect to the Holy Eucharist. In a Book called "a plea for toleration," he spoke of "the visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our Churches," but before his trial, in a new edition, he substituted, "the real and actual presence of our Lord, under the form of bread and wine, upon the altars of our Churches," omitting the word *visible*. The Judge of the Arches' Court decided, that this "change of language might be regarded as a recantation of an error, which must otherwise have been condemned, and finally decreed that, "to describe the mode of presence as objective, real, actual, and spiritual, is certainly not contrary to the Law." Against this judgment, there was an appeal to the Judicial Committee, who affirmed it, stating their opinion however, that Mr. Bennett's words were "rash and ill-judged, and perilously near a violation of the law."

The three charges, as stated by their Lordships, were, that the Respondent had contradicted the Articles and the Prayer Book: 1, as to the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion; 2, as to sacrifice in the Holy Communion; 3, as to adoration of Christ in the Holy Communion. Upon the first they say, "the two propositions, that the faithful receive Christ in the Lord's Supper, and that the wicked are in no wise partakers of Christ, when taken together, do *not* appear to be contradicted by the statement, that

there is a real, actual, objective presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, after a heavenly and spiritual manner." "The Respondent has never affirmed, that the Body of Christ is present in a corporal or natural manner. On the contrary, he had denied this, and speaks of the presence in which he believes as spiritual, supernatural, sacramental, mystical, ineffable." Upon the second, they say: "It is *not* lawful to teach that the sacrifice or offering of Christ upon the Cross, or the redemption, propitiation or satisfaction wrought by it, is or can be repeated in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, nor that in that ordinance there is, or can be, any sacrifice or offering of Christ, which is efficacious, in the sense in which Christ's death is efficacious, to procure the remission of the guilt or punishment of sins. It is well known, however, that by many divines of eminence, the word Sacrifice has been applied to the Lord's Supper in the sense, not of a true propitiatory or atoning Sacrifice effectual as a satisfaction for sin, but of a rite which calls to remembrance, and represents before God that one true sacrifice." "To apply the word sacrifice, in the sense, in which Bishop Bull has used it, to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, though it may be liable to abuse and misapprehension, does not appear to be a contravention of any proposition legitimately deducible from the 31st Article."

Upon the third charge they say: "The Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements. She has been careful to exclude any act of adoration, on the part of the minister, at or after the consecration of the elements, and to explain the posture of kneeling prescribed by the rubric." But they add, "some of their Lordships have doubted whether the word 'adore,' though it seems to point rather to acts of worship, such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration, or prayers addressed to Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements, or of any corporal or natural presence therein." And finally, "his language has been rash, but as it appears to the majority of their Lordships that his words can be construed so as not to be plainly repugnant to the two passages articulated against

them, their Lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised."

That Mr. Bennett used very extreme language, and was chargeable with inexcusable laxity and rashness, must be admitted by every one who has looked into the case. And even the Judge of the Arches' Court, who treated his views as essentially justifiable, had to speak emphatically in condemnation of the mode of expressing them. But upon the principles adopted in the Gorham case, it was not possible to condemn his opinions; and in fact it is not easy to determine, since the decision in that celebrated case, what statements can be proved to be so repugnant to the language of our formularies as to incur legal condemnation. When that judgment was delivered, one party in the Church rejoiced in its supposed victory, but far seeing thoughtful men perceived, that the door was thereby opened to doctrines of a very different character, and that one after another might be denied or misstated with impunity.

But while much latitude is allowed in doctrine, the Committee are very strict as to practice; and their Lordships said, "in the performance of the services, rites and ceremonies, ordered by the Prayer Book, the directions contained in it must be strictly observed, no omission and no addition can be allowed. But the Church of England has wisely left a certain latitude of opinion in matters of belief, and has not insisted on a rigorous uniformity of thought, which might reduce her communion to a narrow compass."

Their Lordships' decree cannot be strictly observed, because in our services there are some occasions when we are not provided with any directions for our guidance, but its general soundness must be admitted, and I now again urge you, as I have urged in times past, to a strict observance, as far as may be possible, of the rules and orders of the Church. If we must err on one side or the other, it appears to me, that error in excess, is ordinarily a less evil, than in defect, for in the former case all that is ordered is strictly observed, while something over and above is done. But we commonly find the negligent disposed to condemn their more careful and scrupulous brethren; and this is not surprising, because such strict observance is a reproach to themselves. A great advance would be made towards uniformity, if the party commonly charged

with omissions would redeem the pledge published by their recognised organ.

"Let the law be settled by a competent authority," says the Record, "and we take upon ourselves to say, that Evangelical Churchmen as a body, will be found ready to accord a loyal obedience to it, for they hold the obligations of law to have a much higher claim upon them than any personal preferences of their own on secondary questions of ritual." But notwithstanding this assurance, the orders of the Church, which are perfectly clear, or have been already settled, are systematically violated, by many of those whose sentiments the Record professes to represent.

It is however, generally admitted by thoughtful men, that in the present age of freedom and enquiry, all attempts to enforce a rigid uniformity, either of doctrine or of practice, must be futile, and, since a National Church must be comprehensive, that within certain limits much diversity should be allowed. Moreover, the very excesses which we deplore are tokens of life. Whenever there has been a great awakening, a stirring up of the vital energy, a quickening and revival of the Church, there have been, and must be, irregularities on one side or the other; and the most abnormal workings out of life are better than the dull uniformity and quietness of death. They, however, who, having pledged themselves to conform to the regulations of a certain system, wilfully or carelessly violate their pledges, are to be condemned; and no organization can be maintained without some restriction of individual liberty. There must be an authority to interpret the laws, and obedience to the recognised authority is a Christian obligation, when it does not conflict with our higher duty.

That some persons are endeavoring to restore Mediæval corruptions, which our Branch of the Church has deliberately rejected, is too true; but they are few, and the profession of the leading ritualists should be accepted, that they believe themselves to be acting in strict accordance with the spirit of the Prayer Book, as it was left at the last revision. One thing is certain, that the excesses are encouraged by every semblance of unfair treatment, and, that ritualism will never be checked in England, so long as the Bishops give the people reason to suppose, that they do not mete out the

same measure to all, that they treat with severity the addition of some unauthorised ceremonies, while they connive at the neglect of many positive orders, even at the mutilation of the services, and the entire omission of one of the Creeds. In my opinion, there are only two fair and equitable courses to be pursued consistent with equity. Either there should be a rigid enforcement of uniformity, and strict observance of the rules of the Church, in every detail, which is impracticable, owing to the diverse circumstances of our congregations; or equal latitude should be allowed on both sides of the exact line. I have adopted the latter course, and although the variation in this Province has been almost entirely on one side, and some few of you have taken undue advantage of my non-interference, I am thankful that, upon the whole, the effect has been satisfactory, and that most of you, my Brethren, appear to be heartily, honestly, and conscientiously, endeavoring to fulfil your vows, and to conform, as strictly as you can, to the constitutions and orders of that Branch of the Church of which you are ministers.

While speaking of these manifestations of self-will, I must not pass over the sad case of Bishop Cummins, who, having lately seceded, is endeavoring to add another *new sect* to the many by which the unity of the Church is broken. On the tenth of November last, he addressed to the Senior Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, a letter of resignation, saying, "I therefore leave the Communion, in which I have labored in the sacred ministry for over twenty-eight years, and transfer my work and office to another sphere of labor," and three days later, he issued notices for a meeting to be held in New York on December 3rd, "for the purpose of organising a Reformed Protestant Episcopal Church." Here then he admits, that he is about to set up a new Church, in the place of that which has existed from the beginning; and you will observe that, in his letter to the Senior Bishop, he spoke of transferring his office as well as his work. The functions of his office he has pretended to exercise, not only in the ordination of Priests and Deacons, but even in the consecration of a Bishop, Mr. Cheney of Chicago. I believe the preliminary steps have been taken for his deposition; but time is allowed by the Canons for his repentance, and withdrawal of his abandonment of the Church.

With respect to persons admitted by him to Holy Orders, since his resignation of his office and work in the Branch of the Church in which he received authority to ordain, I have no hesitation in saying that they are not to be acknowledged as ordained ministers at all. That a Bishop, having no Diocese, may go about the world ordaining whom he pleases, and that such persons are to be recognised by the Church, although they may be destitute of any qualification, is contrary to common sense. It has been held, from the first, that some irregularities cause ordinations to be null and void. Thus, in the Council of Nice, the ordination of Priests without due enquiry is declared null and void, and also that by a Bishop for a Diocese wherein he has no jurisdiction. And if such irregularities can ever invalidate the act of ordination, the acts of this man must be held to be invalid, most especially in the pretended consecration of Mr. Cheney, who was himself under sentence at the time, and incapable of receiving power to perform any ecclesiastical function.\* Any Clergyman performing the functions of an office while under suspension, is guilty of "irregularity," which, in its ecclesiastical signification, is equivalent to felony, and involves *ipso facto* deposition and excommunication.

The case of Bishop Cummins is very sad, for there is reason to fear, that he never heartily embraced the doctrines of the Church of which he was for about seven years a Bishop, although he had taken an oath, of "conformity and obedience to her doctrine, discipline and worship." It is certain that these were the same, when he quitted her, as when he took that oath, and he does not allege any change in his own views, as a reason for abandoning her communion. He speaks of the prevalence of false doctrine, in the Diocese in which he was an assistant Bishop, but having the sole charge *actually*, although not nominally, he was himself pledged to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine. He has pretended, that he desired to return to what he calls Bishop White's Prayer Book, which in fact was not Bishop White's, and was never adopted by his branch of the Church, having only been

---

\* Sentence of degradation from the Ministry was solemnly pronounced upon Mr. Cheney, by the Bishop of Illinois, in accordance with the unanimous judgment of the Church Court, in June 1871.

put forth by a Committee in 1785, and superseded, after four years in 1789, by the Prayer Book *as it now is*, which was used by Bishop White for nearly forty years until his death. Moreover the Prayer Book to which Bishop Cummins refers contains the doctrines which he repudiates, upon the Sacraments, the Orders of the Ministry, and Confession and Absolution of the sick. He is very strong upon the necessity for a revision of the Prayer Book, affirming that "the only true remedy," for what he condemns as erroneous, "is the judicious, yet thorough revision of the Prayer Book." But in a sermon preached in 1861, and repeated in 1867, he takes as his theme, "the fitness of the Book of Common Prayer, to be the bond of unity, the manual of worship, for all the confessions which divide Protestant Christendom, the golden chain to restore the ancient unity of the Kingdom of the Redeemer." The special fitness of the Prayer Book to fulfil this office, arises, he says, from the fact, that "it embodies, as no other uninspired volume does, the ancient and primitive Catholic faith of Christ's Church. This goodly robe of the bride of Christ is wrought out of the purest gold of divine truth; its warp and its woof are alike Holy Scripture." Again, "are not these facts evidence that the system of the Prayer Book is the system of the Bible? This is the boast, this is the honor of our Church. Let her willingly submit to the ignorant reproach, that men of every creed can find in her something to favor their views, while she shares this reproach with the Word of God." Once more, "where is the longing of the soul, which it does not satisfy, where the craving it does not appease; where the deepest experience of the love of God which finds not here an appropriate utterance? Where the contrition which cannot unburden itself in its penitential pleadings? What soul-sorrow finds not fitting expression? What soul rapture may not find wings for its Heavenward flight, in these anthems worthy to be chanted by Cherubim and Seraphim?" "Come and see is our reply to him who would depreciate the liturgy, and tell us that its tendency is to deaden spirituality, and to make formal lifeless Christians. Come and see the saints of lofty stature, the men and women of lofty holiness, the mighty wrestlers with God, the meek and lowly followers of the Lamb, whose names and works are now the heritage of all Christen-



dom, and whose lives are most truly the fruit of Prayer Book nurture."

I must apologise for quoting so much from such a man, but his sentiments are so just, and his language so good, that we cannot find a better or truer eulogium of our Prayer Book. Alas! how fallen is he now! how strangely perverted his judgment! To say the least, what is to be thought of his fitness to be a guide, and the founder of a sect, who, after twenty-two years acquaintance with the Prayer Book, could describe it in such glowing terms, and within six years condemns it, affirming that a thorough revision is the only remedy for the numerous errors which, in his opinion, are nourished by it in the Church in which he had ministered for eight and twenty years, which is to-day precisely what it was when, leaving the Episcopal Methodists so called, he entered her ranks and received a commission to promulgate her doctrines. He now takes advantage of that commission, and of the still higher office to which he had been called, to injure her, as far as he can, by a new schism of which he is himself to be the leader, in which, in short, judging from his conduct on the day of the organization of the sect, he expects to be the lord and master. But the question immediately occurs to us, if there is no special advantage in Episcopal ordination, and all ministers are to be equally esteemed, whether deriving their authority from Christ or from the congregation, what can he as a Bishop do that *they* can not? what rights, power or authority has he, by virtue of this office? and why did he attempt to consecrate another Bishop? And again, does he really mean, that he would regard as true ministers, with whom he ought to hold communion, all who claim to be such, the Unitarian and the Universalist for example, or would he undertake to reject some as unsound, thus arrogating virtual infallibility to himself? Is it to be endured, as it must be if this union principle be admitted, that a minister denying the validity of infant baptism shall have a right to occupy our pulpits, and to tell us that we are unbaptised outside of the covenant of grace?

Unhappily Dr. Cummins is not the first Bishop, who has become a schismatic or a heretic, and has attempted to found a new sect; and it will be with him as it has been with others, that his work not being of God will come to naught, but in the meanwhile he

may be the occasion of leading astray some who, having not been well grounded in the faith, are liable to be blown about with every wind of doctrine. We hear that, in this Dominion of Canada, two congregations have been organized under his superintendence. Let us hope that they may speedily recognise their error and return to the old paths.

An attempt has been made to liken this to the old Catholic movement, but there is this essential difference. The old Catholics are what their name indicates, they walk in the old paths. The Branch of the Church, of which they were members, has formally adopted new Articles of Faith, which they have declined to accept; but there is no such plea for Bishop Cummins. The Church from which he has seceded maintains, that nothing shall be required to be believed as an Article of the Faith, but that which may be proved by the Holy Scriptures. Bishop Reinkens has been constrained, by the peculiar circumstances of a large body of Christians, deserted by their Pastors, and left, through no fault or act of their own, as sheep without a shepherd, to accept the charge over them. Only to a superficial observer, can the two cases appear to have any thing in common.

Some persons have indeed ventured to suggest, that this new so-called Reformed Episcopal Church is in the same position as the Church of England at the Reformation. But it can scarcely be necessary to demonstrate the fallacy of such a comparison. It is sufficient to notice that the rejection of the Supremacy of the Pope was the act of the whole Church of England, in her Convocation in 1531, and that the work of reformation was gradually and cautiously conducted in and by the Church itself. There was no secession, and no schism, until, on the publication of the Pope's Bull in 1570, they who recognised his authority were compelled to separate themselves, and to inaugurate in England the Roman Schism.

There has been of late so much discussion of the subject of confession, that I must not pass it over unnoticed. Auricular confession, or private confession to the ear of the Priest, is as you know obligatory in the Church of Rome, and declared to be necessary for salvation; but this obligation only dates from the Lateran Council in the thirteenth Century. According to the teaching of

our own branch, it is generally admitted that such confession is not *enjoined*, and the question is, whether it is encouraged or even allowable. The maintainers of the affirmative have at least this *primâ facie* support, that it is twice recommended, under particular circumstances, in the Prayer Book, and that it is *not* enumerated among the Romish abuses condemned in the Articles, and that it is formally sanctioned by the 113th Canon. That there is a prevalent strong prejudice against the practice of auricular confession we all know, but popular prejudices are not always reasonable, and are very often traceable to a confusion between the use and abuse of their subject matter. That confession is a condition of forgiveness, requires no proof, for we all believe that "if we *confess* our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins." Here confession to God [alone is mentioned, but many sins are also against our neighbors, and some occasion public scandal. In these cases, we also learn from Scripture, what accords with our own judgment, that there should be confession also to the person injured, or to the whole Church, and not only so, but where possible restitution or satisfaction, as set forth in the exhortation to the Holy Communion.

In primitive days such confession was public, and the restoration of this discipline, the Church in the Communion Service, affirms to be desirable. But it was afterwards deemed expedient, to substitute private confession, and penance, until at length penance was elevated to the rank of a sacrament, and an elaborate system was adopted, requiring an accurate investigation of the details of every sin, in order to determine the penance to be enjoined as a satisfaction. Hence arise the objections most commonly urged against confession, as part of the sacrament of penance, and therefore necessitating these minute enquiries and disclosures. But setting aside the notion of satisfaction, to be made according to the Roman system, there is no occasion for such exact scrutiny. The confessor, being made acquainted with the nature of the sin, and being satisfied of the penitence of the sinner, may grant absolution, without any such minute investigation; and if this distinction were admitted, and understood to be practically recognised, the most effective objections now urged against the practice would be obviated.

That auricular confession, as at present understood, was not practised in the Primitive Church may be certainly affirmed, the confessions in those days having been made to the congregation, or at least the penance being openly performed, and the absolution invariably pronounced in public, even when the Priest had first been privately consulted. But in the third Century, a special officer was appointed in each Church, to receive confessions of secret sins, to prevent public scandal, which office however was abolished in the Eastern Church after about one hundred years. This is strong evidence against the present doctrine of the Church of Rome, that confession is obligatory, and essential to the pardon of sins. And one of the leading writers of that Church upon this subject says, "it would be untrue, and absolutely contrary to the mind of all the Fathers, to conclude that salvation could not be obtained without the exercise of penance. They held in the fullest and most absolute sense the efficacy of true internal contrition.\* And some of the strongest maintainers of the utility of confession, and of the sacramental character of absolution, such as Dr. Pusey, and Mr. Carter, state, that the Fathers use language altogether "inconsistent with any law or custom of compulsory confession."†

With respect to the teaching of our own reformed Branch of the Church, we are thankful that we are in harmony with the early ages. I think the fair inference is, that she would not have confession habitual, but that she recognises its benefits and would encourage its use, under certain circumstances, as set forth in the exhortation to the Holy Communion, and in the service for the visitation of the sick, and this with a view to absolution as expressly stated therein. We find too that the foreign Confessions of Faith generally agree, in maintaining the necessity of the power of the keys, with our own principal Divines since the reformation. They condemn the teaching that it is *necessary* for every one, and that postbaptismal sin can only be pardoned through penance; but they agree that private confession of sin is beneficial, and may be necessary for *some* persons. Of our own Divines, I think it may be well to quote at some length the words of one whose name is

---

\* Morinus quoted by Carter Doctrine of Confession, p. 35.

† Carter, p. 27.

familiar, but whose works are probably not as well known to some of us as they ought to be. Hooker speaks as usual very cautiously, but in this case very decidedly.\* "It is true that our Saviour by those words, 'whose sins ye remit they are remitted,' did ordain judges over sinful souls, give them authority to absolve from sin, and promise to ratify in heaven whatsoever they should do on earth, in execution of this their office. Howbeit all this, with two restrictions, which every jurisdiction in the world hath, the one that the practice thereof proceed in due order, the other that it do not extend itself beyond due bounds, which bounds have so confined penitential jurisdiction that, although there be given unto it power of remitting sin, yet not such sovereignty of power, that no sin should be pardonable in man without it." Again, "Albeit we willingly confess with St. Cyprian, 'the sins that are committed against him, he only hath power to forgive who hath taken upon him our sins, he which hath sorrowed and suffered for us, he whom God hath given for our offences,' yet neither did St. Cyprian intend to deny the power of the minister, otherwise than if he presume beyond his commission to remit sin, where God's own will is it should be retained."

"It pleaseth God, that men should sometimes, by missing this help, perceive how much they stand bound to him for so precious a benefit enjoyed."

"Strange it were unto me, that the Fathers, who so much everywhere extol the grace of Jesus Christ, in leaving unto his Church this heavenly and divine power, should, as men whose simplicity had generally been abused, agree all to admire and magnify a needless office." "The sentence of ministerial absolution hath two effects: touching sin it only *declareth* us free from the guiltiness thereof, and restored unto God's favor; but concerning right in sacred and divine mysteries, whereof through sin we were made unworthy, as the power of the Church did before effectually bind and retain us from access to them, so upon our apparent repentance, it truly restoreth our liberty, looseth the chain wherewith we were tied, remitteth all whatsoever is passed, and accepteth us no less returned then if we had never gone astray."

---

\*Hooker Eccles. Pol. VI. Cap 6, Sec. 3-5 Keble's Edition.

You observe then Brethren, the clear distinction between the power of absolution, as explained by Hooker, and that maintained by Romanists since the Council of Trent; the former is declaratory and the latter strictly judicial, for "our Lord and Saviour," they say, "hath ordained His Priests judges, in such sort that no man which sinneth after baptism can be reconciled unto God but by their sentence."\* If it be strictly a judicial act, then it follows that it is essential to pardon, and generally necessary to salvation. Now it is certain, that our Church has *not* required all her members to have recourse to the Priest for private confession and absolution, and therefore it follows, that she only recognises such absolution as declaratory, although she would have it highly valued, as an authoritative declaration, by officers duly commissioned for that purpose, and therefore bringing comfort to the soul of the penitent, and imparting well founded confidence in the time of affliction, and in the hour of death. That the form, "ego absolvo te," or I absolve thee, as retained in our absolution, is not necessarily judicial, is shown by Bingham,† and it appears to have been used for three centuries before absolution was decreed to the judicial. It must therefore mean, "I, having heard thy confession, believing thee to be penitent, and sincere in thy desire for pardon, do declare that in my judgment thou hast fulfilled the necessary conditions, and therefore I exercise the authority committed to me, and assure thee that thou art pardoned." Even the strictest maintainers of the judicial character of absolution, admit the necessity of contrition in the recipient, in order to give efficacy to the sentence; and therefore the benefit is not more certain, according to the one theory, than according to the other.

The whole value of absolution must depend upon the authority, under which it is pronounced, and this is especially the commission given to the Apostles, by the great Head of the Church, on the day of his resurrection, as soon as he had overcome the sharpness of death, which words are repeated at the ordination of every Priest. They who dispute the power of the Keys, object that this was not the primitive form, that in fact these words were not used in the

\*Hooker Eccles. Pol. VII, Cap. 6, Sec. 2.

†Antiquities Book XIX, Cap. 2, Sec. 6.

ordination of Priests until the thirteenth Century ; and this is true, but if the authority was originally conferred, it must belong to all who are ordained to the office, and commissioned to discharge the functions of the ministry of reconciliation, whether the words are actually recited or not. The Primate of the Church of Ireland has however shewn, in a Charge lately published, that the very words were used at the ordination and consecration of Bishops from the very earliest ages.\* The prayer of consecration given in the so called Apostolic Constitutions, and another, in an ancient manuscript representing the use of the Western Church in the fourth Century, ask for this power. There are other ancient manuscripts of the same tenor ; and the reason for this use of the words was probably that " the Bishop in the Primitive Church, was considered to be the proper minister of absolution, and all the power of discipline was lodged in his hands. But inasmuch as the needs of the Church required more than he was able personally to perform, the Presbyters, as his proper assistants, were taken in to be fellow laborers with him, and to act on his commission, (*i. e.* merely as his deputies) in administering discipline. As the Church increased in numbers, more and more of the work was committed to the Presbyters. But the ancient view lingered long in the Church. It was not till the thirteenth Century that our Lord's commission was introduced into the service for the ordering of Priests, and the power of the Keys, which they had hitherto exercised as assistants to the Bishop, was conferred upon them directly and personally, in the words of the shepherd and bishop of their souls. The change appears to have been a reasonable one ; as the Presbyters of the Church already executed the functions these words conferred, by preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments, by prayer, and exercising the discipline of the Church, it seems proper that the authority should be conveyed to them direct, and not merely by commission as assistants to the Bishop." However this may be, the Primate has evidently arrived at his conclusions, after careful investigation ; and if he is correct, the objection, based upon the supposed late introduction of the words into the Ordination Service,

---

\* Charge delivered by the Archbishop of Armagh in 1878. p. 16.

is thoroughly refuted. Moreover, with reference to their meaning, he says, (and you will remember that he is a very decided anti-ritualist,) "there is not a vestage of authority for asserting, that the Church in any age sanctioned such an opinion, as that these words had respect only to sins against the Church, without any reference to sins as against God. What those words meant, when spoken to the Apostles, that they meant as applied in the ancient ordinals to the Bishops, and that they meant when they were transferred to the service of the ordination of the Priesthood, and that they also meant when retained by our reformers in their amended Ordinal."\*

The attempt to make these words bear a non-natural interpretation, would be called Jesuitical, by the persons who thus explain away their meaning, if such tampering with words were attempted by an opposite party. Those very solemn words have been pronounced over each of *us*, my Brethren; let us not lightly regard them, nor neglect the weighty commission thereby conferred upon us. I would fain hope, that none of us have presumed to accept ordination to the Priesthood, without being satisfied as to the propriety of the use of this form, for that would be sacrilege, and that, if unhappily any one so ordained has since adopted the opinion that they are not rightly used, or are meaningless, such an one will not continue to officiate under what is, in *his* judgment, a profane assumption. What these words meant when addressed to the Apostles, the same must be their meaning now. We have no right to assume that the Apostles could read the hearts of men, that is the prerogative of God alone, and no such power is attributed to them anywhere, the gift of discerning of spirits being quite a different thing. They could not forgive absolutely, nor condemn according to their own judgments, but they could pronounce the acquittal of those who gave satisfactory proofs of penitence and faith, and this authority is conferred on every Priest now. Some are unable to accept this high truth of God's word, but in reality there is no more difficulty in believing this now, than when the words were uttered. It is as hard to believe, that St. Matthew or St. John could remit sins, as that this power can be given by the

---

\* Charge—Appendix, p. 57.



Holy Ghost now, and with whatever qualifications it is to be accepted now, by the same it was modified then.

Let us not then, my Brethren, hesitate to invite heavy laden sinners to come to us, that we may point them to Christ, and that to those who have come to him, but are still doubtful, and through fear of presumption unable to rest in his love, we may speak the comforting words assuring them of pardon, and bidding them be of good comfort. The words are provided for us, let us not neglect to use the exhortation. But on the other hand, I earnestly entreat you, not to attempt to lay a yoke upon those for whom Christ died which may be intolerable, and I solemnly charge you, to beware of so urging confession, with a view to absolution, as though confession to God were insufficient, as though the atoning blood might not be directly applied by the great High Priest. The intervention of the human agent may frequently be of great value, but this is owing to the infirmity of our nature, for which our Lord in his infinite mercy has compassionately provided, while they who can, by a direct act of faith, appropriate the promises, and discern the invisible, are stronger than they for whom such aid is indispensable.

Connected with confession and absolution, and often confounded with them, but in great measure distinct is "direction." This is most frequently desired, and to satisfy this want peculiar qualifications are required in the minister, who ought indeed to be specially trained for this work. The confessor, acting only ministerially, may perform his duty well without any special ability; but he who acts also as a director requires much skill and wisdom, and can only be efficient after long experience. In common apprehension the two offices are invariably connected, and practically they are likely to be so very frequently. He who receives the confession of sins, and weaknesses, and doubts, and perplexities, is expected to be able to supply ghostly counsel and advice. There are many cases occurring in the life of man, where with the best intentions, it is very hard to determine for oneself what is right. Tender consciences are often troubled with needless scruples and doubts and fears, while persons of a different temperament, under the influence of self interest, or some other perverting cause, do not perceive the guilt of positive evil. The intervention of Nathan was

required to arouse the sleeping conscience of David, and we all know, with what soothing self deception the transgressor can commonly put away troublesome thoughts and stifle his convictions. But in confession the sinner has, as it were, to face the realities of his condition, his acts have to be clothed with form and substance, and are brought before him in their true proportions, and with the aid of a judicious counsellor he is enabled to detect secret motives and springs of action, which would have escaped his own unaided investigation. The advantage of having recourse to the ministers of religion, for aid of this kind and for spiritual advice, is recognised by all who have any knowledge of human nature; and such confidential intercourse with the individual members of his congregation is sought by every minister, who has any regard for their welfare, and any earnest desire for the salvation of souls.

So far then as regards such intercourse, its value being admitted, the question is only whether it is better that it should be solemnly conducted, with certain regulations as to method, and time, and place, or that its character should depend upon accidental circumstances, being conformed to the ordinary customs of society? One essential *condition* is the assurance of secrecy with reference to all such confidential communications, in whatsoever form, or under whatever circumstances, they may be made. No one can be expected honestly to disclose his sins, his weaknesses, and his temptations, to the minister of God's Word, however great his anxiety and his desire for counsel, unless he can be assured that such revelations will not under any circumstances be divulged. You are aware that the rule of the Church is very strict in this matter, that by the 113th Canon of our Church, the minister who has received a confession is bound not to reveal it to any person whatsoever, under pain of irregularity or of deprivation and incapacity to hold any spiritual office. And it is our bounden duty to take heed, that we never give the least occasion for suspicion, that anything communicated to us, as the ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, may possibly be spoken of or made known to any other persons. The ministrations of the Parish Priest must be very indefinite, without point or application to the *special* wants of his people, unless they have such confidence in him, that they are not afraid to make him

the depository of their needs, their perplexities, and their infirmities.

To sum up then, our conclusion is this, that private confession is recommended in our system, as remedial rather than as an habitual practice, as a medicine for the relief of troubled consciences, or under special circumstances, and not as one of the ordinary means of grace.\* Enough is said to shew that it is allowable, and therefore scriptural, to seek for special absolution in this way, but the language is sufficiently guarded to suggest that a more excellent way is, not to require it, to go at once to the fountain head, and by faith to realise the absolution spoken by the Holy Ghost the Comforter to each penitent sinner.† There is unquestionably a danger in some cases, of relying too much upon the guidance of the Priest, so as to weaken the sense of personal responsibility, and of substituting the audible voice, for the secret communication of the Holy Spirit, but the abuse of any good is no argument against its use.‡ Only knowing the danger, you should beware of urging as obligatory what is not so enjoined in Holy Scripture, and while ready, in the performance of your duty, to receive every one who desires the benefit of the ministry of reconciliation, you should not in any way encourage habitual recourse to a remedy appointed for extreme cases.

It is probable, that extreme partisans, *on either side*, will object to these statements, but they are the result of careful investigation, and may be proved to be in strict accordance with the teaching of our own branch of the Church. It is my duty, to proclaim and set before you the truth, and to explain that teaching, without considering whether it may be acceptable or otherwise; but I may observe, that it can only be rightly apprehended by the diligent student, while popular opinions are commonly to be attributed to a merely superficial acquaintance with the subject to which they relate.

---

\* Cf. Moberley's Bampton Lectures, p. 231.

† Nor could there be any stronger proof that Confession was acting unhealthfully, or was unsuitable under the circumstances, if it were found to interfere with, nay, if it did not rather foster and deepen, the free and childlike intercourse of the divinely quickened Spirit with its God.—*Carter Doctrine of Confession*, p. 237.

‡ Cf. The declaration of the Old Catholics, respecting Auricular Confession, published in the Guardian, June 10, 1874.

In looking over the annual returns, I am thankful to find that, within a few years, there has been in many, or I may say most, of your Parishes a marked increase in the administrations of the Holy Communion, and I trust that the few exceptions will not long continue in that unenviable position. You have each received a charge, to be "a faithful dispenser of the Word of God and of his Holy Sacraments." Are you fulfilling your obligations, when you do not afford your people frequent opportunities of complying with their Lord's injunction, "this do in remembrance of me"? Woe be to the shepherds who feed themselves and not the flock, who withhold the means of grace, and debar the faithful from the sacred food for which they hunger. There may unhappily be, in some Missions, few or none so hungering, there may be a reluctance, instead of a desire, to partake more frequently, but this is probably the fault of the Pastor rather than of the flock, and a consequence of his defective teaching. At all events, your duty is clear. So long as two or three are willing to gather together, it is for you to provide for them; and for yourselves too the celebration is needed; how can you expect life and energy and power, for the work of the ministry, if you do not continually feed upon Him who is the life? The opinion that we may afford to dispense with means, or that it is a token of advanced spirituality to disregard them, is presumptuous, and the offspring of pride, which is incompatible with spiritual growth. Apparently honouring God, it actually dishonours him, setting up a human system as preferable to the Divine.

We observe the same principle, through all His dealings with man, that He uses means, He requires man to co-operate with him. As the same God rules in the spiritual, and in the material world, so we must believe that both are governed upon the same principles, and we may argue from the visible to the invisible, from the known to the unknown, from the material to the spiritual. In Him "we live and move and have our being," and yet neither life nor health can be secured without our co-operation. The leprosy of Naaman was taken away by Him, but the washing in Jordan was an essential condition. The man born blind only recovered his sight after his eyes had been anointed with clay, and he had washed in the pool of Siloam. Jesus when he fed the multitudes in the wilderness,

did not distribute the bread himself, but through the agency of the Apostles. The knowledge of the way of salvation, *might* be imparted by a direct revelation to the soul, as it appears to have been to St. Paul, but ordinarily "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God." The enquiry has often been heard, what is the use of prayer? God is omniscient, why should we tell Him our necessities? Yet no believer doubts the efficacy of prayer, or its necessity if we would have our wants satisfied. How is it then that they who profess to love the Lord Jesus Christ, and to accept without hesitation or demur, all his teaching, fail to perceive that the Holy Sacraments, which He hath instituted, are generally necessary to salvation, and that, if we would feed on Him, if we would have our souls nourished by His body and blood, we must use the means appointed by Himself, the bread which we break, and the cup which we bless, in accordance with His own example and injunction, which are affirmed by His Apostle to be the Communion of his body and blood. Wherever the celebrations are increased, there is almost invariably a corresponding increase of communicants. There may be some who presume to draw near to the Holy Table, without the wedding garment, who may be rejected by the King; but, nevertheless, it is our duty to invite, and to try to persuade, all to come with due preparation.

It may be said, that people, who receive the Scriptures, know their duty in this respect, and do not require to have it more frequently set before them. This plea if good for anything, must be good to a much greater extent, and may be used to show that all your ministrations are superfluous. I do not find that they, who are negligent in enforcing the benefits of the Holy Sacraments ordained by Christ, are at all scrupulous about repeating over and over again the same elementary truths, with which their hearers have been familiar from their childhood. In fact, we know that, if we would teach any truths effectually, line must be upon line, and precept upon precept, and it must be attributed partly to the neglect of the ministers of God's Holy Word and Sacraments, that so large a proportion of most of our congregations, although regular attendants at public worship, and constant hearers and readers of the Word, are yet self-excommunicated, and at the same time unconscious of

their danger. It is argued, that this duty is not very frequently inculcated in the Epistles of the inspired Apostles, the unerring guides and teachers of the Church of Christ. But the answer is plain, simple, and conclusive. The taking part in the breaking of bread was an essential condition of fellowship with the Apostles. The persons addressed were members of the Church, "called to be saints," instructed in the way of salvation, familiar with its practices. Any such teaching as we have now to repeat and enforce, would then have suggested a doubt, as to that which was unquestioned, would have assumed the possibility of a neglect, which was then without example. When the Disciples came together in those days, it was not so much to hear sermons as to break bread, so that it could be said of the whole body, "We being many are one bread, and one body, for we are all partakers of that one bread," that bread of which our Church affirms, in accordance with the inspired Word, that to "such as rightly, worthily and with faith receive the same, it is a partaking of the body of Christ." Of the teaching of our Church, concerning the Holy Sacraments, I refrain from speaking more particularly, as I explained my views very fully in my last Charge, (in 1870) to which I refer you for this, as well as for other important subjects, necessarily passed over on the present occasion.

It must unhappily be admitted that, however faithfully you may preach, and enjoin this duty, and warn your congregations of the danger of neglect, many will still be unconvinced, or if convinced will still follow their own way, and walk according to their own devices. Many will be hearers only, and not doers of the Word, however faithful and earnest the preacher may be; and some may try to satisfy their consciences, by finding fault with you, when you press them too hard, and charging you with teaching false doctrine, if you would have them adopt a higher standard, than may be needful for the maintenance of respectability. They cannot appreciate the pearls which you cast before them, and will therefore turn again and rend you. But notwithstanding all this, and making allowance for inevitable failures, you may labor in the confidence that all will not be in vain, that some of the seed sown will take root, and bear fruit.

When there are large congregations, and few communicants, it may commonly be inferred that the Pastor has been too much inclined to set up himself, instead of the chief shepherd, before the flock, that he has been more anxious, to have them come and hear him preach, and to be in their estimation as "a very lovely song of one that hath a pleasant voice, and can play well on an instrument," than to have them seeking for the food provided by their Lord. And the proportion of communicants in any congregation may ordinarily be taken, as a fair criterion of the diligence and faithfulness of the minister. The hearers are many in these days, and a ready speaker will always attract an audience, although his words may convey little sound instruction, and may be rather adapted to please the ear, than to affect the heart. Doubtless it is very pleasant and cheering to have a full Church, and there is a powerful temptation to adapt our preaching to the tastes of the people, who are apt to say virtually, "speak unto us smooth things prophesy deceits." There are few members of any congregation who are wise enough, and large minded enough, to wish to have the truth set before them, in all its parts, and from all points of view. Most men are more or less one-sided, and the majority of people cannot bear to have their prejudices assailed, whereas the honest seekers after truth will always be glad of the opportunity of hearing both sides of every question, wishing to be convinced, if their own views are not correct, and knowing that, if they already hold the truth, the result of argument and investigation must be to confirm it. The most popular system will be that which involves least trouble; short and easy methods are popular, in religion as well as in other subjects, and they who will be well pleased, if you invite them to the House of God to hear a sermon on the Lord's day, will be indignant, if you speak of the duty of coming on other days to worship Him. The importance of faith is readily admitted, because, so long as it is merely a sentiment, it is intangible, and may be supposed to exist without involving much difficulty or self-denial; but faith in action, the external manifestation of that which, unless manifested, may be assumed to have no existence, implies devotion and self-sacrifice; and no teaching can be popular which insists upon these features.

Let us ever bear in mind, my Brethren, that, while we are to be servants of all men for Christ's sake, in all things wherein we may do them good, we are to be teachers and guides, we are ambassadors for Christ, we must proclaim his message in its integrity, we are responsible for the publication of the truth, as our people are for the reception of it. And you must not shrink from claiming this authority, so that all who are entrusted to your care may understand their obligation to give heed to the Word spoken by you. We do not by any means claim for ourselves infallibility, but we ought to speak as clothed with a divine commission, so that they may feel, that we have a *primâ facie* claim to be heard, and that, if after a full and honest examination of our teaching in any particulars, they are unable to reconcile it with the Holy Scriptures, they may feel that the obligation to reject it is no trifling matter, but that in so acting they are incurring a grave responsibility. Owing to defective training and the self-will, and self-sufficiency, now prevalent, very many people assume to themselves the office of critics and judges, who, far from being qualified to judge or to teach, "have need that one teach them again which be the first principles of the oracles of God," their ignorance being proportionate to their presumption. I fear that the misconceptions of the teaching of the Church, not to say the utter ignorance of it, so commonly to be deplored in her sons and daughters, is to be attributed in great measure to the want of early training, and the defective teaching in the Sunday Schools. It is your bounden duty, to endeavour to make them intelligent Churchmen and Churchwomen, and not to afford occasion for the reproach, too frequently well merited, that our congregations know less than any others of the grounds of their faith. So long as this is true, you must not be surprised, that you do not gain adherents from other Christian bodies, or that you lose some of the most earnest members of your own congregations, when they are assailed with arguments, which they cannot answer, on behalf of other systems, or are attracted by some specious indications of a more active spiritual life, then they could discern among ourselves.

I trust that negligence in imparting such knowledge may never be attributable to ignorance or indifference on your own part.



"The priests' lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth." If you are not fully persuaded in your own minds, you will teach with stammering lips, and give utterance to uncertain sounds, and will not prevail. Great is the power of truth ; but you will not persuade others, unless you are yourself convinced that you are armed with it, that the way in which you would guide your hearers is the true and the right way, wherein they will find aids, and enjoy privileges, not to be found elsewhere.

And withal look to your *motives*, for defect *there* will be fatal. The salvation of souls is the great work, in which you are to be laborers together with God, and with this is closely connected the edification of those who are in a state of salvation. In either part your success will depend much upon your own experience. "The love of Christ constraineth us ;" this should be the description of every ambassador of Christ, and it will *not* constrain you, unless the power thereof is felt by yourself. No theories, no book learning, will suffice, you must speak of that you do know, and testify of that you have seen, if you would be successful in turning many to righteousness. Let your first object be to awaken the sleeper, to convert the sinner from the error of his ways, to persuade him to give himself to Christ, to rely upon the one sacrifice, once for all offered upon the cross, as the propitiation for his sins, and to manifest his faith and love by self devotion and self-sacrifice. And then having laid the foundation, building on the rock of ages, you must take heed to the materials with which you build, you will be anxious and careful, to the utmost of your power, to exclude all but the pure gold. You will rightly deem it of great importance, that your converts, and all entrusted to your care, over whom your influence extends, be led to understand, and rightly to use, the means appointed by the Lord himself. In proportion to your love to Him, and your simple dependence upon Him, will be your anxiety to adhere closely to His institutions, and your estimate of the importance of every part of the system organized by Him, under the conviction that "the foolishness of God is wiser than men, and the weakness of God is stronger than men." In whatever you do, and whatever you teach, let the Lord Jesus Christ be the central object, so clearly set forth, so plainly held up to view, that every

line converging to the one point, may carry the eye to Him, "God manifest in the flesh." To know Him, to live in Him, to win Him, to be found in Him, these are the things to be desired. Insist upon this, as the only source of true holiness, the condition of our sanctification—that there must be a real union with Christ, that there is danger in every thing that may in any respect interfere with that union. And withal, let us take heed to ourselves, let us be watchful against the dangers to which we are exposed, if we preach what we do not feel, if our piety be professional instead of personal, lest that terrible fate be ours, of which the Apostle speaks, "lest that by any means when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway."

## APPENDIX.

---

In accordance with the request of the Synod, I authorize the use of any one or more of the following Psalms :

FOR ADVENT.—18, 46, 50, 96, 97, 98, 100.

FOR EPIPHANY.—2, 19, 45, 72, 87, 96, 97.

FOR LENT.—6, 25, 32, 38, 39, 51, 55, 86, 102, 130, 141, 143.

FOR PALM SUNDAY.—40, 56, 79, 118, 126, 129, 142.

FOR ALL SAINTS.—1, 16, 24, 30, 84, 91, 107, 147, 149.

FOR ANY FESTIVAL.—8, 29, 34, 48, 66, 73, 75, 91, 96, 111, 115, 138.

FOR HARVEST THANKSGIVING.—65, 103, 107, 113, 141, 145, 148, 150.

FOR SYNODS AND MEETINGS OF THE CLERGY.—66, 68, 84, 122, 133, 134.

---

### NOTE TO PAGE 20.

As an example of a case, in which there can be no doubt as to your obligation, both legal and moral, I again call your attention to the rubric before the Prayer for the Church Militant. I have required you to obey the directions of that rubric, of which the plain common sense interpretation has been distinctly enforced by the Committee of Privy Council, therefore you, having taken the oath of Canonical obedience, are without exception bound to conformity. How the obligation can be evaded, even according to the most lax explanation of your oath, I am unable to imagine; but I have to grieve over the fact, that some of you are still habitually violating your oath in this respect, although it is now sixteen years since I first authoritatively enjoined the observance of that particular rubric.

The judgment of the Lords of the Council is as follows: "The rubric directs that, at a certain point in the course of the Communion service, (for this is no doubt the true meaning of the rubric,) the Minister shall place the bread and wine on the Communion Table, but where they are to be placed previously is nowhere stated. In practice, they are usually placed on the Communion Table before the commencement of the service, but *this certainly is not according to the order prescribed*. Nothing seems to be less objectionable than a small side table, from which they may be conveniently reached by the officiating minister, and at the proper time transferred to the Communion Table."